

Utah State Building Board



MEETING

March 20, 2002

MINUTES

Utah State Building Board Members in attendance:

Keith Stepan, Chair
Larry Jardine
Haze Hunter
Kerry Casaday
Manuel Torres
Kay Calvert

DFCM and Guests in attendance:

Joseph A. Jenkins	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Kenneth Nye	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Kent Beers	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Shannon Lofgreen	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Leslee Chavez	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Dave Williams	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Blake Court	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Alyn Lunceford	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Doug Fullmer	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Alan Bachman	Attorney General's Office/DFCM
Raylene Ireland	Department of Administrative Services
Randa Bezzant	Governor's Office of Planning and Budget
Kevin Walthers	Legislative Fiscal Analyst Office
Kim Wixon	Department of Health
Dennis Keller	Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control
Ken Wynn	Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control
Greg Peay	Department of Corrections
Bob Askerlund	Salt Lake Community College
David Clark	Department of Agriculture
Gary Thorson	State Parks
Rolynne Christensen	VCBO Architecture
Lynn Samsel	Department of Human Services
Bart Hopkin	Department of Human Services

Brad Mortensen	Utah System of Higher Education
Ken Frank	Department of Public Safety
Brent Windley	Utah State University
Darrell Hart	Utah State University
Dave Cowley	Utah State University
John Huish	Utah State University
Bill Juszczak	Department of Transportation
Rep. Loraine Pace	House of Representatives

On Wednesday, March 20, 2002, a regularly scheduled Utah State Building Board meeting was held in the Utah State Capitol, Committee Room 129, Salt Lake City, Utah. Chairman Keith Stepan called the meeting to order at 9:00 am.

☐ **APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JANUARY 28, 2002.....**

Chair Stepan sought a motion for the January 28, 2002 Building Board minutes.

MOTION: Haze Hunter moved to approve the Utah State Building Board meeting minutes of January 28, 2002. The motion was seconded by Larry Jardine and passed unanimously.

☐ **REPORT ON LEGISLATIVE RESULTS**

Kenneth Nye referenced the report included in the packet outlining the Legislature's actions. After the session was over, the State projected additional shortfalls in revenue. To Mr. Nye's understanding, there were no anticipated actions to freeze projects. DFCM's capital budget was primarily done on a General Obligation bond, so delaying projects would not help the budget problem other than the debt service delays would have an impact on how the construction could aid the economy.

Mr. Nye referenced the schedule summarizing the capital budget issues addressed by the Legislature. He noted the previous state funds column dealt with the Governor's cancellations of the appropriations in FY2001. The column identified the projects which had funding previously canceled and then restored in the last Legislative session. Most of the restoration of funding came on the bond bill to be issued late in the fiscal year and will allow the projects to begin immediately.

Two fine art projects received small funding increases to address the issues involved with delays.

The engineering projects at the University of Utah and Utah State University were previously funded with cash. Those projects had a funding shift occur beyond what had

been discussed with the Board based on some of the earlier actions of the Governor. The capital improvements received a funding reduction of \$4.4 million and were the only part of the funding reductions not restored. The projects affected by the \$4.4 million will require replacement funding out of the regular capital improvement allocation received.

Mr. Nye stated the National Guard American Fork Armory had been previously authorized for \$1.6 million on a General Obligation bond based on an anticipated Federal match for the construction. However, the Federal government was not forthcoming with their match and therefore the project was canceled.

Mr. Jenkins noted the Board had not been notified of, or approved, the University of Utah Health Science building which arose due to an emergency situation and a high need to build the building. The Legislature funded the building which has not been planned or programmed.

Mr. Nye also noted \$800,000 was allocated to Utah State University Merrill Library for planning and programming. The University of Utah received authorization to design their library using \$2.8 million of donations.

An analysis was performed on the two separate existing engineering buildings at Utah State University during which one building was deemed to be usable long term and the other was deemed non usable. The project currently underway at Utah State was part of the four classroom combined project and will build a new engineering building adjacent to the existing building. A large portion of the existing building will be demolished. For the renovation, Utah State has also committed to raise \$10 million in donations in order to proceed. Construction will begin once this occurs.

The Archives building was also discussed, but was not funded and has been postponed for next year.

Mr. Nye referenced the comparison of the Building Board recommendations and noted the Legislature followed the Board's recommendations through their first 12 prioritizations and then some minor differences occurred. The Board had previously recommended that planning occur for the Connor Street facility for the Deaf and Blind, however there has been some question regarding how the entire program should be addressed. Mr. Nye was unaware of the Legislature taking any formal action on the issue, but thought a review of the program functions apart from the facility was desired. Another departure from the Board's recommendations was on the Capitol Preservation Board for the Capitol building renovation. The Legislature funded the design as recommended by the Board and then allocated an additional \$8 million to build an underground parking structure to help alleviate the parking problems.

The Legislature also added the Health Sciences classroom building at the University of Utah. A lot of the importance for the building came about last fall when the Capital Facilities Committee toured the library projects and the Health Sciences project at the University of Utah. The University placed the library as their number one priority in their recommendations to the Building Board due to the large donations available for the project. The Legislators were convinced the Medical School was in more critical need to proceed.

Mr. Nye also said the liquor store in Tooele was the only project authorized on a lease revenue bond and the Board will need to act when appropriate in order to get the financing underway. DFCM may need authorization by the Board in order to reimburse costs incurred.

Sandy City withdrew their interest in working on the Sandy Courts project removing the land purchase as an option. However, the Legislature authorized intent language for DFCM to program a new facility for the Courts. Mr. Jenkins stated they would begin the planning process to increase their existing facility to a ten Court facility and then request additional funding next year. Mr. Nye stated the planning process was funded out of fees generated by the Courts and the intent language authorizes them to proceed with the programming which must be approved by the Building Board and Legislature before proceeding with design.

The Weber State McKay-Dee property purchase was withdrawn by Weber State due to negotiations with the hospital. DFCM also withdrew their suggestion for the OMC building purchase which effected the recommendations.

Haze Hunter expressed concern about the Legislature bypassing the Building Board and buildings being funded without input from the Building Board. He questioned the purpose of the Board and the Legislature.

Kenneth Nye stated the items passed would not have a significant impact on DFCM or the Building Board. DFCM anticipated the bonds would close at the end of the fiscal year in order to avoid impacting the debt service, but should not delay any of the projects.

Mr. Jenkins also noted there was intent language passed for non-state funded buildings. The Board may review projects approved for delegation for future action.

Mr. Nye stated the Department of Transportation directly approached the Legislature requesting permission to purchase a facility in Huntington for a maintenance station. UDOT had not contacted DFCM or the Board before approaching the Legislature; however the

intent language requires approval from the Building Board and DFCM before the proposed purchase can proceed.

Bill Juszczak, Department of Transportation, stated he was contacted by the Price District approximately one month earlier who informed him Cox Products was selling their property in Huntington. Since it was during the Olympic break of the Legislature, they determined it would be best to approach the Legislature directly. UDOT was currently preparing to make an offer for the property, and if an agreement was reached, they would return to the Building Board for action.

In regards to intent language, Mr. Nye referenced the forms summarizing the legislative actions which basically authorized projects. One project with particular note included the Salt Lake County Court which instructed the Court to request approval of the program from the Board. He also noted the National Guard maintenance project was not appropriated as capital improvement funds, but felt DFCM would include the project in the capital improvement fund recommendations on May 1. Kent Beers previously worked with the National Guard on developing the list of projects and hoped to see the \$1.6 million directly awarded in the discussions in May.

Other notable intent language pertained to the University of Utah Marriott Library remodel design which essentially authorized the University to proceed with the design using institutional funds and then request reimbursement funds next year. The Legislature emphasized they were not making commitments for funding next year on the project.

Chair Stepan asked Mr. Nye to comment on Senate Bill 160, Aeronautics Construction Revolving Loan Fund. Mr. Nye stated Senator Hickman sponsored the bill in effort to develop a funding structure for a new airport in St. George in the future. The bill simply set up a funding process within the Department of Transportation under the Transportation Commission to allow them to fund projects for the construction of airports and listed a number of potential funding sources of which some would require separate Legislative action. One possible funding source included the Building Ownership Authority, which would be difficult to structure a financing through without changing statute.

Kenneth Nye reminded the Board of their previous approval of the delegation for Utah State University for the current new heat plant building and the addition of the central chilled water system and cogeneration plant. Utah State is financing the energy project and using energy savings, which saves utility costs in order to pay the debt service on the project. The Legislature also adopted intent language to authorize the savings of the utility bills to cover the cost of the debt service. Due to the size of the project, Utah State desired legislative acknowledgement of the project.

Representative Loraine Pace commented she was extremely frustrated with the Legislative session as was Representative Gerry Adair who had decided not to re-file. She noted the final list developed by the Committee was done with the final decisions being determined by House and Senate leadership and the Governor. Representative Pace was disturbed and felt the decisions were against the dialogue during the session of not funding new construction due to the lack of O&M. Representative Pace was absolutely opposed to the final decisions, as were others who had viewed the buildings and met with the Board. In closed caucus meetings, she moved to simply decide on the level of bonding and then allow the Committee to prioritize the projects. However, the final decisions were made without the Committee. Representative Pace also moved for the Committee to decide the level of bonding next year on the second day of the session and then set aside enough caucus time for the entire Legislature to listen to the projects. She felt if they were going to continue to make the decisions and ignore the Committee, then they should be better informed. The Speaker offered a substitute motion to put \$800,000 into planning for the USU Library, which was later changed to include programming and design. She shared the Board's frustration of those who were putting the time and effort into the process but then were ignored.

Chair Stepan thanked Representative Pace for her comments and acknowledged her advocacy for the Board. The Board appreciated her support, time, and effort to identify the projects and their needs.

MOTION: Larry Jardine moved to commend Representative Loraine Pace for her work. The motion was seconded by Chair Stepan and passed unanimously.

Chair Stepan stated the Board will also miss Representative Gerry Adair.

☐ CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT PROCESS.....

Joseph Jenkins expressed desire to address the capital development process alongside the Value Based procurement issue. He stated DFCM wished to ensure the processes were understood by agencies, institutions, and the public. DFCM wanted to discuss the capital development process and develop a document for distribution to the public identifying the project, how you go through the project, how to get the project on the list, the method of selection and the manner of construction. Mr. Jenkins identified DFCM would assign a Project Director to the project who would then make a preliminary decision on the method of construction. The Building Board then makes its prioritizations for presentation to the Governor and the Legislature and then for the Legislature's authorization. After authorization, the Building Board and DFCM then determine whether to delegate the project. Final determination is then made on the method of construction by DFCM. A new

change of this process is for the design/build process where now, the programmer cannot be a member of the design/build team.

An analysis was also provided outlining the duties performed by the Project Directors. Mr. Jenkins explained that DFCM has tried to change the terminology and will now refer to the former Program Directors as Project Directors.

❑ VALUE BASED PROCUREMENT

Mr. Jenkins referred to the Value Based Selection process and the document distributed further defining the process. This document was a draft for the Board to review before approving a formal document. All changes were underlined.

Kay Calvert questioned the current debriefing process of the A/E's and contractors after a selection is made. Mr. Jenkins responded DFCM currently debriefs those requesting a debriefing; however no one is notified up front of the opportunity. In the future, DFCM wishes to notify everyone of the opportunity to be debriefed if they so desire. This is done on a one-on-one basis. Kenneth Nye stated one other change DFCM was trying to implement is to only allow one DFCM employee to perform the debriefing in order to avoid giving out conflicting or confidential information.

After DFCM determines the method of construction for the first step in the Value Based Selection process, management will then select a Project Director. The Project Director has the responsibility of developing an RFP and scope for the project. DFCM will then determine a list of submittals required from each firm making their presentation as well as the selection criteria and special concerns and risks of the project. Some criteria will apply to every project and some specific criteria will apply exclusively to the project. The preceding items will be accomplished and prepared as a handout at the pre-bid or registry meeting in order to ensure full disclosure of the information and will also be distributed to the selection committee.

In order to ensure a fair and unbiased selection process, DFCM has decided to have a five member selection committee, including a member of the Building Board and just one representative of the agency. The selection committee will make the final determination on the selection. DFCM will then choose the selection committee site.

Mr. Jenkins explained that only the subcontractors who are critical must be brought before the selection committee. The Project Director may identify which subs or consultants are required and any additional will be at the General Contractors discretion.

After the selection committee makes their final determination, the Project Director then

awards the bid and does the debriefing of the firms not selected. During the selection process, the Project Director is not a voting member, acting only as a facilitator, and should not be part of the deliberative process. It is imperative that the selection process be free of any bias or inappropriate guidance. DFCM simply sought a fair selection process made by five well meaning and informed individuals who will make the selection and not guide it other ways.

Regarding submittals, DFCM is in the process of creating a databank for every firm in the State of Utah with past performance ratings on projects over the last five years. A firm without past history with the State of Utah, or project history for three projects in the last five years in the State of Utah, DFCM simply asks them to provide three references of the last three jobs completed. DFCM would then grade them similar to the others and prepare their reference criteria in order to not exclude any firm without business history in the State of Utah.

Also with the new Value Based Selection process, the architects, engineers, and contractors are required to disclose in writing to DFCM if they have been debarred, suspended, or removed from any project within the last five years. Disclosing this information will not automatically exclude them. The selection committee will evaluate the circumstances. If the issue remains under investigation, DFCM may still wish to provide the information, even though a final determination has not been made.

Mr. Jenkins then referenced the management plan and the most recent criticisms of the length and expense to prepare. He emphasized the management plan is not a marketing document and should simply identify how the firm will manage the project, resolve the risks identified in the RFP or any other foreseeable risks. The management plan will no longer be blind, and may also discuss how they will resolve, manage, and administrate the selection criteria, and identify any unique construction or design alternatives on to their management plan and finally make a final statement as to their competency on the project. The selection committee will use the management plan as a reference document during the interview. Management plans will not be required on projects generally below \$1.5 million unless there are unique circumstances involved. Pooled projects that exceed the \$1.5 million will not require management plans.

DFCM will also require a statement of qualifications for the lead and the individual. This document will be given to the selection committee and can encompass some marketing aspects if the firm or individual so desires.

Selection criteria for all projects include a past performance rating, project lead rating, project team rating and any unique construction alternatives. Cost will be evaluated as well with the exception of A/E selection.

Raylene Ireland asked when the weighting criteria came into play in terms of letting the respondents to the RFP know the value or the weight being placed on particular elements. She felt they would want to know prior to submitting the RFP where the greatest weight was going to be applied in the process. Joseph Jenkins stated the selection committee would make the determination of setting the criteria and placing the weights. DFCM will not predetermine the factors. Ms. Ireland suggested other State procurements identify the weights in the RFP documents. She suggested DFCM request feedback throughout the process and make adjustments if they prove to be necessary. Chair Stepan stated the Board members would consider the information individually and give feedback to Mr. Jenkins.

Mr. Jenkins stated the selection criteria applicable to all individual projects may consist of experience in doing a particular type of work, product specifications, and site constraints. The Project Director will make the determination of the specific criteria and inform the selection committee prior to the evaluations.

Darrell Hart commented that if the selection committee was going to do the weighting of the criteria, then possibly the Project Directors should be allowed to vote as they were highly regarded and could provide good input on the criteria weighting. He cautioned against limiting the agency. Joseph Jenkins stated someone from DFCM would be involved in the selection committee, but it would be a different Project Director than was involved with the project. The Project Director assigned to the project will be able to provide input as to the scope and the nature of work pertaining to the project, but will not be able to interject any comments about a firm competing for the job. No preferences or bias may be expressed.

The VBS selection matrix will also be given to the selection committee as well as the selection committee guidelines. The guidelines will explain the process including signing the confidentiality form indicating their vote had not been influenced. There will also be a list of the selection criteria, a copy of the management plan, a copy of the qualifications, conflict of interest form and a scoring sheet identifying the key elements of the project. On the day of the selection, the selection committee will be informed of their requirements including the need to evaluate past performance, the interview with the project lead, and the project team. They will evaluate and score project specific selection criteria and then use their complete VBS scoring matrix for deliberations and discussions and then weight the criteria. After making the final scoring, they will then review the cost proposals and then deliberate again. They will then make a final selection and provide a statement of justification as to why they made their selection.

Kent Beers stated DFCM proposed to not include the preliminary scoring results as part of the permanent record. This decision is to allow the committee to be absolutely free for

deliberations and discussions.

Mr. Jenkins stated DFCM is finding that the current environment in the State of Utah is bringing a lot of firms to apply for projects. DFCM has discussed a process of a first cut to minimize the applicants. He expressed hesitancy on doing this as he wished to ensure there is a legitimate criterion to base the cut.

DFCM currently allows firms to submit bids over budget if value engineering can be included without changing the scope of the project. DFCM has proposed distributing a list of prices to all participants stating there are some firms who have over bid. The participants will then need to value engineer and if it cannot be done without changing the scope, they may wish to withdraw. Chairman Stepan asked the Board to consider the proposal. He had some concern with the challenge of confidentiality and a challenge to the quality of projects. Mr. Jenkins stressed that this should not provide a message that price is the most important factor as it is not. DFCM will discuss the issue at the next meeting for finalization.

Kent Beers emphasized the project specific criteria portion will have a core of four or five criteria consistent for every single project. Using the program document working with the agency, the Project Director will then develop some specific criteria for the particular project. The specific criteria portion was the most significant change and the committee will need to become familiar with these criteria and recognize that is how the selection will be made in the scoring.

Chair Stepan asked audience members to provide their input to Mr. Jenkins or the Board for consideration prior to the final deliberation next month.

Kent Beers asked the Board to make a formal recommendation to not include the preliminary scoring as part of the permanent record.

MOTION: Haze Hunter moved to not include the preliminary scoring of the VBS process as part of the permanent record. The motion was seconded by Manuel Torres and passed unanimously.

Raylene Ireland stated the Board previously gave a commendation to Representative Pace and then noted Representative Adair had not filed to run again. She thought it was a significant development for the State Building Board and the State of Utah as Representative Adair had been in public service for ten years and he chaired the Capital Facilities Subcommittee for eight. Representative Adair used considerable political and personal capital to change the process exponentially in terms of providing some dignity and order into something more closely resembling what the process should have been. Having

him depart from public service is such a huge issue, she proposed the Board acknowledge the substantiate role he played in the process. He should not pass quietly back into private life without some acknowledgement of what he has done.

MOTION: Larry Jardine moved to amend his previous motion to acknowledge Representative Gerry Adair with Representative Loraine Pace and to send each a letter. The motion was seconded by Haze Hunter and passed unanimously.

Chair Stepan commended former Board members of the process of increasing the integrity and credibility of the Board. DFCM will draft a letter for Chair Stepan's signature.

☐ CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT ALLOCATION PROCEDURES

Kent Beers provided a brief overview of the capital improvement process. Last November the agencies submitted DFCM with a copy of their requests for this year's capital improvement projects. DFCM received approximately \$133 million in requests this year. From November through March, DFCM staff tours the capital improvement requests to obtain a first hand view of each project. Through March and April, DFCM staff develops a preliminary list of improvement projects for recommendation alongside the agencies and institutions. In April, DFCM will release their preliminary list of recommendations and begin meeting with the agencies to discuss their concerns. During the Building Board meeting at the beginning of May, DFCM will then make its formal recommendations to the Board as to which projects should be funded. DFCM received \$133 million in requests and were authorized by the Legislature for about \$49.4 million for improvement dollars. The Building Board makes the final vote to allocate capital improvement funds in May.

☐ DFCM CONTRACTOR AND A/E PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS

Kent Beers reviewed example for the DFCM Contractor Performance Rating for state jobs. The first six questions were project specific and substantial completion related. Ratings from one to five could be allocated based on project completion.

The various questions pertained to the OCIP project safety rating, value engineering alternatives, management and quality of the subcontractors, and completion of punch list items. The State Building Official and the DFCM Project Director will also provide an overall final rating. The Project Director's score will be submitted into the system and will be reported to the selection committee members in the future.

The agency was also asked questions in terms of thinking about the quality of the project, compliance with contractual commitments, and the management of the project. The

agency then will be asked to provide an overall rating of the project. The A/E firm will also be asked to give an overall rating of the contractor on the project.

The contractor would have three ratings submitted from DFCM, the agency and the architect respectively which would be reported to future selection committees. This raw data will help them understand the past performance of the contractors.

A similar form was also prepared for the rating of past performance of architects and engineers and DFCM's performance for each job.

Chair Stepan stated another concern of any project is the administration or the management handling of the project i.e. submitting change orders on time. He felt safety was important and could possibly be developed into an overall administration of the project.

The final overall rating from DFCM will be all that is reported to the future selection committees in addition to one overall rating from the agency and one from the architect. All ratings will count equally.

❑ ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS OF UNIVERSITY OF UTAH AND UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY

John Huish, University of Utah, reported for the period of December 14, 2001 to March 1, 2002 three A/E contracts were awarded. A design contract was awarded to Gould Evans Associates for the renovation of the existing Merrill Engineering building. Two other A/E contracts were awarded for improvement projects on parking lots. Three construction contracts were also awarded for improvement projects for fire detection/suppression upgrades and alarms.

Mr. Huish stated the Olympic cauldron may become a permanent feature of the Rice-Eccles stadium. Another donor has stepped up along with SLOC and the original designer to reduce the height and relocate it to a fountain.

MOTION: Haze Hunter moved to accept the administrative report of the University of Utah. The motion was seconded by Kay Calvert and passed unanimously.

Brent Windley, Utah State University, reported for the period of December 12, 2001 to February 27, 2002. Two A/E contracts were awarded including one for a new high voltage distribution water line project currently underway and one for fire land access routes.

Two construction contracts were awarded for the period including one for the Biotechnology Building fume hoods, which was slightly over on the contract amount due to old controls. The Taggart Student Center SW Chiller also received a construction contract and two small deductions from the contingency reserve fund. The reserve fund decreased to \$111,971.31 based on the contract awarded for the Biotechnology Building fume hoods.

The open construction contracts displayed an open contract which had been delayed a year due to a statement delays on a roofing project.

Chair Stepan stated it seemed like the First Dam repairs project had been on the list forever. Mr. Windley stated they should be out of the actual river by April 1. Darrell Hart added they made a consciences decision to delay the project as originally planned because of the situation with the river and long term lead item delivery.

MOTION: Larry Jardine moved to accept the administrative report of Utah State University. The motion was seconded by Manuel Torres and passed unanimously.

☐ ROOF ACCESS POLICY

Joseph Jenkins stated a need to develop a policy for access onto their roofs. Many individuals request access, however it creates a liability concern as well as a concern for damage to the roofs. In the past, it has been addressed on a case by case basis, but a formal policy is now necessary. The policy would also primarily focus on installation of equipment.

Kay Calvert felt security should be added as an issue and DFCM should obtain information about the individuals going on the roof. Jack Quintana stated the policy suggests there will be an escort.

Kenneth Nye mentioned the policy would definitely have an impact on the agencies and institutions operating their own buildings. He solicited their review and input of the proposed policy.

Chair Stepan felt the policy was very much needed and the timing was excellent. The Board will make a final determination next month.

☐ ABC 10 YEAR LEASE

Joseph Jenkins stated the ABC liquor store in the Avenues has resided in a shopping center at approximately 416 6th Avenue for the last several years. A new owner has

recently purchased the shopping center with hopes to completely remodel and renovate it and will offer increased space in the center for a new ABC liquor store.

Normally, the State prefers five year leases, but in this case, the landlord is requesting a ten-year lease. The lease is also slightly higher than usual; however, the ABC is a revenue generator for the state which could compensate some.

Ken Wynn, DABC, stated a new liquor store could not be relocated in the same area. Although the rent is slightly higher, it would double the size of the current space. The current space is under the Smith's meat department and plumbing problems have caused meat debris to drain onto their inventory. He asked for their support in approving the ten year lease.

MOTION: Kay Calvert moved to approve the ten year lease extension. The motion was seconded by Haze Hunter and passed unanimously.

☐ REALLOCATION OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS DAVIS ATC

Kent Beers stated last May, the Building Board authorized \$326,000 to Davis Applied Technology Center to recoat their shop floors. The costs actually accrued were considerably lower than the initial estimates and approximately \$140,000 - \$150,000 was saved.

Davis ATC has a new request on this year's upcoming project list and has requested a new boiler and a summer boiler. They wish to have the funding authorized immediately based on the previous savings in order to have it installed by summer. The new boiler and summer boiler are anticipated to cost approximately \$125,000 - \$130,000. The Davis ATC requested the Board authorize this reallocation of funds.

Kent Beers stated the summer boiler is a small boiler which would allows them not to run the full boiler during summer months.

MOTION: Larry Jardine moved to authorize the reallocation of funds for Davis ATC. The motion was seconded by Kay Calvert and passed unanimously.

☐ ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS FOR DFCM

Joseph Jenkins stated most of the issues were self explanatory unless there were any questions. There were no questions on behalf of the Board.

Joseph Jenkins stated one of the buildings DFCM leases in Payson has recently caught fire. This was caused by an unattended vehicle with a small child rolling back into the building and running over a gas meter. They were able to remove the child from the vehicle and fortunately no one was in the building, however the 10,000sf building was destroyed. DFCM has relocated some operations and are now in the process of trying to obtain a new location for Human Services.

Chair Stepan also reported Norm Tarbox, Board of Regents, has accepted a position with Weber State University as the Vice President of Administrative Services and will be relocating approximately mid-May. He will be missed for his contributions towards the Building Board. His involvement has been invaluable.

☐ UPCOMING VALUE BASED PROCUREMENT SELECTIONS.....

Kay Calvert noted she would be serving on the selection committee for the Dixie College Gardner Student Center Kitchen on Tuesday, March 27, 2002.

Chair Stepan requested as much advance notice as possible when final dates are set. Mr. Jenkins stated shortly all project and selection schedules will be available on the website. This should aid in providing more information for the Board.

Kenneth Nye stated the design of Shakespeare Centre was still on hold as they have not raised enough money to proceed through construction. However DFCM is proceeding with the selection of the construction manager and developer on June 3 and 4, 2002. Haze Hunter will serve on the selection committee.

Kenneth Nye added many new projects recently authorized by the Legislature will be scheduling selections. DFCM will be contacting Board members over the next few weeks, primarily for the Snow College and Soldier Hollow Golf Course projects.

☐ BUILDING BOARD TOURS.....

DFCM suggested the need to tour projects this summer, primarily the Archives project, the University of Utah and Utah State University library projects. The Board may also want to travel to Cedar City and look at their two new proposals and the renovation upgrades to Old Main and Braithwaite.

Kenneth Nye stated one advantage to touring in September is that better information is available. DFCM will also be finalizing their recommendations to the Board regarding project scopes and budgets. Also, touring Higher Education campuses are more beneficial when classes are in session in order to witness the impact of students.

Chair Stepan stated his experience on the tours has been invaluable and has provided good insight. It has also been very valuable to have members of the Capital Facilities Committee participate on the trips as well.

Kenneth Nye suggested the Board normally meets September 4 and the Board of Regents is tentatively scheduled to meet in Logan on September 5 & 6. The Building Board and the Board of Regents have typically had a joint meeting around that time of year and he suggested holding the tours on September 4 and ending in Logan. The Board could then meet as a whole and jointly with the Regents the following day. Mr. Nye also noted several projects in the Salt Lake area could be toured in conjunction with other Board meetings.

☐ 2002 BUILDING BOARD MEETING SCHEDULE.....

Kenneth Nye identified two dates on the schedule he wished to bring to the Board's attention. Currently the normal Board meeting for July is July 3 and he proposed changing it to July 10 due to the Independence Holiday. It was also proposed to meet at the University at this time as well.

Mr. Nye also stated October 14 is a state holiday. This is a key meeting for the Board as they set the priorities for their recommendations. The Board proposed to reschedule to October 16.

No Board meeting will be held in April. The next meeting will be May 1.

Chair Stepan requested additional follow up to Mr. Hunter's comments in terms of sending some written letter to the leadership and asked the Board for their consideration. He also suggested carbon copying Representative Pace's and Representative Adair's letters to the Governor and Legislative leadership.

Representative Pace cautioned the Board in lumping projects together. She felt there was opposition in placing money in the University of Utah's library and therefore both library projects went down together because they were linked in discussion and theory. In tight budget years she asked them to use caution that they belonged as there may not be enough funding for all projects. Joseph Jenkins felt Representative Pace was correct and hoped both libraries would be on the same footing in December so both could be funded.

Chair Stepan stated the Board should nominate a Vice-Chair at the May 1 meeting.

☐ ADJOURNMENT.....

MOTION: Kay Calvert moved to adjourn at 11:05am. The motion passed unanimously.

Minutes prepared by: Shannon Lofgreen